

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BEFORE THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

STG INTERNATIONAL, INC.
Employer

and

Case 21-RC-097525

TEAMSTERS, CHAUFFEURS, WAREHOUSEMEN
AND HELPERS, LOCAL UNIO NO. 542,
INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF TEAMSTERS
Petitioner

ORDER

The Employer's Request for Review of the Regional Director's Decision and Direction of Election is denied.¹ The Employer's request to hold this proceeding in abeyance is also denied.

MARK GASTON PEARCE, CHAIRMAN

RICHARD F. GRIFFIN, JR., MEMBER

SHARON BLOCK, MEMBER

Dated, Washington, D.C., April 25, 2013.

¹The Employer contends that the Board lacks a quorum because the President's recess appointments are constitutionally invalid. We reject this argument. We recognize that the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit has concluded that the President's recess appointments were not valid. See *Noel Canning v. NLRB*, 705 F.3d 490 (D.C. Cir. 2013). However, as the court itself acknowledged, its decision conflicts with rulings of at least three other courts of appeals. See *Evans v. Stephens*, 387 F.3d 1220 (11th Cir. 2004), cert. denied, 544 U.S. 942 (2005); *U.S. v. Woodley*, 751 F.2d 1008 (9th Cir. 1985); *U.S. v. Allocco*, 305 F.2d 704 (2d Cir. 1962). This question remains in litigation, and pending a definitive resolution, the Board is charged to fulfill its responsibilities under the Act. See *Belgrove Post Acute Care Center*, 359 NLRB No. 77, slip op. 1, fn.1 (2013). For the same reason, we reject the Employer's contention that the Board's appointment of the Regional Director for Region 21 was invalid.

We likewise reject the Employer's related contention that the Regional Director would lack authority to process representation petitions if the Board lacked a quorum. The Board's delegation of its decisional authority in representation cases to Regional Directors dates back to 1961 and has never been withdrawn. See 26 Fed. Reg. 3889 (May 4, 1961). Consistent with the 1961 Delegation, NLRB Regional Directors remain vested with the authority to conduct elections and certify their results, regardless of the Board's composition at any given moment. Furthermore, in *New Process Steel*, the Supreme Court expressly stated that such delegations were not affected by its decision, and, following that decision, no fewer than three courts of appeals have upheld the principle that Board delegations of authority to non-members remain valid during a loss of quorum by the Board. See *New Process Steel L.P. v. NLRB*, 130 S.Ct. 2635, 2643 n.4 (2010); *Frankl v. HTH Corp.*, 650 F.3d 1334, 1354 (9th Cir. 2011); *Osthus v. Whitesell Corp.*, 639 F.3d 841, 844 (8th Cir. 2011); *Overstreet v. El Paso Disposal, LP*, 625 F.3d 844, 853 (5th Cir. 2010).